

REMARKS

5 In response to the Examiner's Action mailed on May 17, 2006, claims 1 to 25 are presented. The applicant hereby respectfully requests that the patent application be reconsidered.

An item-by-item response to Examiner's objections or rejections is provided in the followings:

10 1. *Rejection of Claims under 35 USC §112*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C.112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

15 In response to the rejections, the Applicant hereby respectfully traverse against such objections. The Applicant would like to respectfully submitted such phrase as MAPatTEL/123-456-7890 not only are fully described in the specification but also are totally clear to those who are skilled in the art with regard to the scopes of the claims. Therefore, the
20 Applicant would like to respectfully submits that the rejections based on 35 USC112 is not proper.

2. *Rejection of Claims under 35 USC §102*

25 The Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C.102(e) as being anticipated by Drury et al (6,707,421).

30 In response to the rejections, the Applicant hereby respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons that Drury DID NOT disclose an invention as directed by the amended claims 1-25 as that amended. As previously discussed in the prior Amendment, however, for the sake of more clearly define the scopes of the invention, claims 1-25 are amended.

October 17, 2006

The amended claim 1 are directed to map retrieval that are different, not anticipated and non-obvious over Drury.

5 The Applicant would like to respectfully submit again that Drury and Yacoby did not disclose the inventions as now presented. There is no basis for the 35 USC 102 rejections.

Specifically, in claim 1, the amended claim now directs to a method for retrieving a map from an Internet web-site comprising:

- 10 a) sending a telephone number for a destination location as a map request to said Internet web-site **wherein said map request is sent through an Internet Protocol with said telephone number provided in a sub-field of an universal resource locator (URL) identifying said Internet web-site**
15 exemplified by www.MAPatTEL/123-456-7890 where MAPatTEL exemplified an URL of said web-site and 123-456-7890 exemplified a phone number is placed at said sub-field of said URL; and
20 b) receiving a map for said destination location from said Internet web site associated with said telephone number.

The amended claim 22 now directs to a network system that includes:

- 25 a) a geocentric server for receiving a numeric data input coded for a destination location as a map request **through an Internet Protocol with said numeric input provided in a sub-field of an universal resource locator (URL) identifying said geocentric server**
exemplified by www.MAPatTEL/123-456 where MAPatTEL exemplified an URL of said geocentric server and 123-456 exemplified a numeric input data coded for a destination location
30 that is placed at said sub-field of said URL; and
b) said geocentric server further includes a database-search enabling means for enabling a geocentric database search for

October 17, 2006

determining a geographic position of said destination location associated with said numeric input.

5 The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner for the rejection under Drury for the reasons that Drury never provides any disclosure for receiving a map request as directed by the amended claim that the telephone number or the numeric input data are included as a "sub-filed of an URL" identifying the website linked to the map server. Specifically, the only disclosures made by Drury in many paragraphs as cited by the Examiner is Column 18, lines 1-7 that are provided below for comparisons.

15 Navigation application 512 also makes use of a yellow pages database 522 that it uses to convert the telephone number of a desired destination to a street address in a "reverse" number lookup. The information needed to construct yellow pages database 522 is provided by an external information system 130, such as a telephone company or a publisher of telephone directories. (Drury Column 18. line 4-10).

20 An operator can specify a destination by specifying the telephone number of the destination. A complete telephone directory is not stored in in-vehicle database 432, therefore, the validity of the telephone number, other than perhaps the validity of the area code, is not verified before the in-vehicle system establishes the communication session with the server system. The server system receives the telephone number and looks in up in a "reverse" telephone directory to determine the street address of the destination. (Drury, Column 24, lines 17-25)

30 The system also includes an input device, such as a keypad on a telephone device, for accepting an annotation from the printed map

October 17, 2006

identifying a chosen geographic feature, an onboard computer for receiving the accepted annotation and providing a planned route to the chosen geographic feature through the roadway network, and an output device, such as the display on a telephone handset, for
5 presenting the planned route information. This system has an advantage of allowing simplified user input by having the user determine short encodings of locations from the printed map. Also, simplified output can also refer to the annotations on the printed map, thereby allowing use of a limited output device. (Drury,
10 Column 3, lines 25-37)

Drury discloses hardware system infrastructure to process the map request. However, Drury does disclose how the request should be sent and processed.

15 On page 4 the Examiner stated that:

“Drury teaches wherein: said step a) of sending said telephone number comprising a step of sending said telephone number as said map request to a map server for processing with said
20 **telephone number provided as a sub-field of said URL identifying said map server** for obtaining an address for said telephone number of said destination location (establish a communication session with server system over cellular telephone link and sends the destination specification to the server system.
25 The in-vehicle system sends information to the server system that allows the server system to determine the vehicle’s starting location, see col. 7, lines 14-19, Drury).”

30 For comparison, Drury Column 7, two paragraphs from lines 6-22 are copied below:

October 17, 2006

5 As the first step, the operator enters a specification of desired destination 692 into in-vehicle system 105. For instance, the operator enters the city, street, and street number of a destination address. The destination is validated by the in-vehicle system, for instance validating that the street address is in an allowable range for the specified street. (Drury, Column 7, lines 6-12)

10 After in-vehicle system 105 has accepted and validated the destination specification, it establishes a communication session with server system 125 over cellular telephone link 110 and sends the destination specification to the server system. The in-vehicle system also sends information to the server system that allows the server system to determine the vehicle's starting location 690. For instance, the in-vehicle system sends the estimated latitude and longitude output obtained from a GPS receiver in the vehicle, or sends other raw output from its GPS receiver. (Drury, Column 7, lines 13-22)

20 According to just a brief comparison, the Drury does not disclose the invention as now specifically directed by the amended claims. For these reasons, the amended claims should not be considered as anticipated by Drury.

25 The amended claims 1-25 are different and unrelated to Drury because the amended claims are directed to method and systems to get map through map requests sent through Internet Protocols with **sub-filed** providing the telephone number. Such process and system are not disclosed or suggested in Drury. Therefore, Drury would not anticipate the amended claims 1-25.

30 3. *Rejection of Claims under 35 USC §103*

The Examiner rejects claims 6-8, 10, 15, 17 and 24-25 under 35

October 17, 2006

U.S.C.103(a) as being upatentable over Drury in view of Yacoby.
According to the Examiner, Yacoby disclosed a normalized telephone
number. It would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to
combine Yacoby and Drury et al, to devise an invention as disclosed in the
rejected claims.


As discussed above, claims 1-25 as presented are directed to the
methods and systems for map retrieval of map for a destination location
associated by a telephone number. As directed by the claims, the processes
involve the use of the telephone number of coded number for
determination of the address, or surrounding areas of a destination
location and then the map is retrieved using the address or the
identification of the surround areas of the destination location. The map
requests are sent through Internet Protocols with sub-filed providing the
telephone number. A combination of Drury and Yacoby would not make
the invention as directed by the claims as now amended.

For the amended claims, the Applicant requests that the rejection for
the amended claims be withdrawn.

With the claims as now presented and the reasons provided above,
the applicant hereby respectfully requests that Examiner's rejections under
35 USC § 102, and 35 USC § 103 be withdrawn and the present
application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted
Kehyeh Szutu

By



Bo-In Lin - Attorney, Registration No. 33,948
13445 Mandoli Drive, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
(650) 949-0418 (Tel), (650) 949-4118 (Fax)

October 17, 2006